EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

U S WEST, Inc. Suite 700 1020 Nineteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036 202 429-3106 FAX 202 296-5157



Cyndie Eby Executive Director-Federal Regulatory

EX PARTE

RECEIVED

July 12, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

JUL 1 2 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Mr. William F. Caton Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222 Stop Code 1170 Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: CC Docket No. 96-98 Implementation of the Local Competition

Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Mr. Caton:

Attached hereto are two copies of a letter that was sent to Ms. Lisa Gelb of the Policy and Program Planning Division. This submission was made at the request of Ms. Gelb and therefore, pursuant to paragraph 291 of the NPRM released in the above-referenced proceeding on April 19, 1996, the submission does not count against U S WEST's page limit for ex parte filings made in this proceeding.

In accordance with Commission Rule 1.1206(a)(1), two copies of the letter are being filed with you for inclusion in the public record. Acknowledgement and date of receipt of this submission are requested. A copy of this transmittal letter is provided for this purpose. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachments

cc: Ms. Lisa Gelb

Cyndie Eby

No. of Copies rec'd CH

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

U S WEST, Inc. Suite 700 1020 Nineteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036 202 429-3106 FAX 202 296-5157



Cyndie Eby
Executive DirectorFederal Regulatory
July 12, 1996

RECEIVED
JUL 1 2 1996

Ms. Lisa Gelb Policy and Program Planning Division Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544 Washington, D.C. 20554

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

RE: CC Docket No. 96-98, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Gelb:

Per your request U S WEST is providing the following description of the Transport Sharing Concept that was discussed at our recent meeting with the Policy Division.

Transport Sharing Concept

CLEC and ILEC (parties) agree that it is their joint responsibility to interconnect their networks in a fair and equitable manner in which each party is responsible for approximately equal transport costs, based on a mutually agreed upon rate structure. For the purposes of this agreement the process used to determine the equitable sharing of transport costs shall be referred to as transport sharing. The facilities addressed under transport sharing are those transport facilities provided by either party which interconnect both parties' respective end office switches. These facilities may include, but are not limited to, end office-to-tandem trunks, end office-to-end office trunks, tandem-to-tandem trunks, and tandem switches. The parties need to jointly agree to the following criteria in order to determine the transport compensation responsibilities of each respective party:

- A transport rate schedule to value each functional rate element; i.e., dedicated and common interoffice transport circuits and tandem switching (note: this could be based on proposed or tariffed transport rates for Direct Trunk Transport (DIT) and Tandem Switched Transport (TST) facilities);

- An economically efficient network design of the facilities required between the parties, based on sound network engineering design principals;
- Each party has the right to provision their own facilities for an amount that is equal to 50% of the total transport cost, based on the mutually agreed upon rate schedule. Alternatively, the parties may provide their share of the transport facilities by leasing facilities from the other party or from another provider; and
- Based on periodic reviews of the transport sharing agreement, each party reserves the right to bring their provision of transport facilities up to 50% of the mutually agreed upon facilities cost.

The application of this agreement is limited to EAS/local wireline traffic that is exchanged solely between the two parties to this agreement and does not apply to third party or transit traffic.

This submission is at your request and therefor, pursuant to paragraph 291 of the NPRM released in the above-referenced proceeding on April 19, 1996, the submission does not count against U S WEST's page limit for ex parte filings made in this proceeding. If you have additional questions please give me a call.

Sincerely,

Cyndie Eby